UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.168
6 May 1992

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 4 May 1992, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ERDOS (Hungary)

- Reports by Chairmen of Working Groups

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent, within one week of the date of this document, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

92-60591 8661V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

REPORTS BY CHAIRMEN OF WORKING GROUPS

The CHAIRMAN: The Disarmament Commission received the first round of progress reports from its subsidiary bodies last Monday, 27 April, and all four Working Groups have begun their second week of deliberations on the respective agenda items.

During the course of deliberations, more views were expressed and various proposals were made by delegations on the subjects under consideration. In particular, I should like to point out that Working Group I, which, as we all know, is in the final stage of its deliberations, has been engaged in intensive work on the subject of objective information on military matters, precisely with a view to finalizing its recommendations.

In accordance with our programme of work, this meeting will be devoted to the second round of progress reports by the Chairmen of the Working Groups on the work on their respective agenda items.

I call first upon the Chairman of Working Group I, Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): Since the first progress report was presented, a week ago, Working Group I, on objective information on military matters, has had six meetings. Furthermore, informal, open-ended consultations have taken place in order to promote solutions to such problems as have been particularly contentious.

The Working Group has completed its first reading of the introductory part of the Chairman's paper of last year and of the section on objectives. It has also nearly completed its first reading of the sections on principles and on scope, and has embarked on its deliberations on mechanisms, which is the fourth and last subtitle in the Chairman's paper of last year which forms the basis for this year's work.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

The atmosphere in the Group is very good, and many delegations are participating actively in the efforts to find common ground on all issues. Last year's paper has been considerably amended as a result of extensive and thorough discussions. The spirit of compromise is indeed very encouraging. We are, however, now rapidly approaching the end of the limited time available to us, and a considerable amount of work still lies ahead. I therefore hope that all delegations will appreciate this situation and contribute to a rapid and successful conclusion of our work.

The CHAIRMAN: We certainly share Ambassador Hyltenius' expectations and hopes that we shall all understand the situation of Working Group I. We shall do as much as we can to provide him with sufficient background, a sufficent time-frame and sufficient infrastructure to finish the Working Group's third and final year of deliberations, in which we are all interested.

I now call on the representative of Peru, who will report on behalf of the Chairman of Working Group III on the questions before that Working Group.

Mr. VASQUEZ (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is pleased to report that in the past week Working Group III has continued its deliberations on the first two topics of the paper submitted by Ambassador Wisnumurti at the 1991 session. Working Group III has so far held six meetings and has succeeded in adopting, while also updating and amending, some of the principles and guidelines in the document, which have to do both with the section on relationship between regional security and global security and arms limitation and disarmament, and the section on principles and guidelines. Delegations have shown heightened interest in this subject as well as a constructive spirit; they have proposed new ideas and principles that have enriched our consideration on this subject.

(Mr. Vasquez, Peru)

Since this is the last week of the Commission's work, and since Working Group III has only three more meetings available to it, it is essential that we accelerate the pace of our deliberations so that we may complete our consideration of the first two topics of the document.

Lastly, I should like to appeal to all delegations taking part in the work of Working Group III to maintain, during this decisive phase of our work, the spirit of cooperation that has been manifested so far.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of India, who will report on behalf of the Chairman of Working Group II.

Mr. WADHWA (India): First of all, I should like to apologize on behalf of Ambassador Prakash Shah, who could not be here this morning due to prior commitments. I have a statement which I shall deliver on his behalf regarding the work of Working Group II.

Working Group II has now held six meetings on the "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons". Since the last plenary meeting, the Working Group has progressed in its discussion of the four agreed topics before it. The Group also agreed on the elements to be discussed under topic 3.

The exchange of views on the first two topics has been completed, and the Group is in the process of completing the exchange of views on the third topic as elaborated by a core group that was chaired by the delegation of Egypt. The discussion of the remainder of topic 3 and of topic 4 - "The role of the United Nations system in the process of nuclear disarmament with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons" - will continue. After the exchange of views on all topics, the Chairman plans to introduce the draft report for the

(Mr. Wadhwa, India)

Disarmament Commission's approval, and this draft report could serve as a basis for the future work of the Group.

To date, there has been a lively exchange of views on the topics, particularly on strengthening the process of nuclear disarmament. In addition, a number of delegations presented working papers which have contributed to the discussions in the Group. Although there are persistent and wide divergences of views on the topics under item 5 of the Disarmament Commission's agenda, there is a noticeable absence of acrimony in the debates, and the Chairman is encouraged that the Group will be able to arrive at an understanding on this item in its future work.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Chairman of Working Group IV, Ambassador Emeka Ayo Azikiwe.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): My progress report this morning is very brief. Working Group IV, on the role of science and technology, held four meetings last week. Progress is slow but reassuring. We have moved a step further from procedural matters. Indeed, we have completed the exchange of views on sub-item 1 on "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", and on sub-item 2 on "Science and technology for disarmament".

We have before us a number of working papers, which we are now closely examining. This afternoon, apart from the scheduled Working Group meeting, an informal group will be meeting to attempt to draft a report on the two first sub-items. This informal group, which will be chaired by Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada, will be open-ended. Meanwhile, the Working Group will commence its exchange of views on sub-items 3 and 4 this afternoon. We hope that sufficient progress will be made on our intended structure of their discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now completed the second round of reports of progress on the various agenda items. As indicated in the adopted general programme of work and timetable, contained in documents A/CN.10/1992/CRP.1 and Informal Paper No. 2, the reports of various Working Groups should be finalized on Friday, 8 May, at 6.00 p.m. for processing, and the Commission will consider and adopt all the reports on Monday, 11 May, in order to be able to conclude its 1992 substantive session. At this point, I should like to ask all those delegations that wish to make concluding statements to inscribe their names on the list of speakers with the Secretariat now.

As a result of consultations at the expanded Bureau meeting held last Friday, it was decided that a meeting of the Committee of the Whole will be convened this morning immediately after this plenary meeting to consider a few questions of an organizational, practical character that might have a bearing on our future work. I therefore intend, after adjourning this plenary meeting, immediately to open the meeting of the Committee of the Whole to discuss these questions.

The representative of Mexico wishes to make a statement at this stage, and I now call on him.

Mr. HERNANDEZ BASAVE (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Now that we are setting out on the home stretch of our session, the Mexican delegation wishes to share with members of the Commission some of its thoughts and concerns on the progress of our work in this "new" Disarmament Commission.

As we have said before, the delegation of Mexico fully supports the revitalization of the Disarmament Commission's work. That is why we are in favour of the process of restructuring the Commission that began two years ago with a view to enhancing its efficiency as a multilateral body for deliberations on disarmament. We agree with the idea that we should have a

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

clear, concise agenda that reflects disarmament priorities and allows us to carry out a thorough and comprehensive consideration of substantive questions.

However, we are concerned by the slow progress in our work on the priority items and by the desire of some delegations to undo the commitments made on a consensus basis to halt and reverse the arms race instead of to work towards reversing the arms race. The Mexican delegation does not share the view that the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has now become obsolete and no longer reflects disarmament priorities.

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

We are very surprised that one of the, supposedly, strongest arguments used by some delegations, including some representing non-nuclear-weapon States, is that the Final Document is now 14 years old; it is argued that it consists of outmoded language belonging to the cold-war era. We are even more surprised that those same delegations fail to adopt a critical attitude to, for example, the idea of nuclear deterrence, which they even defend.

As we have pointed out during the deliberations in the working groups, we are profoundly concerned that some delegations are using the meetings of the Commission to water down or reject the political commitments entered into by consensus in 1978, commitments made in order to achieve general and complete disarmament, beginning with the most urgent matter, nuclear weapons. We are concerned because the world continues to be infested with horrendous nuclear weapons, with no sign of the political will completely to eliminate such weapons, which represent a constant threat to international security and in the short term impede the consolidation of a genuine non-proliferation regime.

The Mexican delegation realizes that implementing the 1978 Final Document requires new thinking, based on and inspired by non-military concepts, and perhaps the development of a new culture in our societies. But this should not cause us to abandon the objective of general and complete disarmament, nor should it compel us to take for granted, as inevitable, the existence of nuclear weapons and the application of doctrines and policies of nuclear deterrence.

Today, almost 25 years into the life of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and notwithstanding the major reductions of nuclear arsenals announced by the two

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

super-Powers, the nuclear Powers possess three times as many nuclear weapons as they did in 1968, when the Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed. Therefore, the Mexican delegation will continue to support the validity of the priorities agreed in the Final Document and to advocate the full implementation of the other commitments in the Final Document.

We urge all delegations to make a serious and honest effort to revitalize our work along the proper lines and not to stray from our priority tasks, not to be carried away by the idea that nuclear weapons are no longer a danger to the existence of mankind, because of the fortunate fact that the cold-war era is now over and hence the danger of a nuclear conflagration has virtually disappeared. Now that none of the nuclear Powers has an enemy that needs to be deterred with weapons of mass destruction we have a unique opportunity to turn round the arms race, to convert military industries to exclusively civilian, peaceful purposes and therefore to abandon the philosophies underpinning the polices of nuclear deterrence.

Lastly, the Mexican delegation reiterates its willingness to do its utmost to come up with texts enjoying the consensus support of all members of the Commission, provided, of course, that such a consensus makes sense and that the agreements thus achieved will not subsequently be disregarded simply because a certain number of years have elapsed since their adoption, even though reality clearly tells us that commitments entered into by consensus should continue to be honoured in order to solve the problems that gave rise to them in the first place. In particular, we must make sure that the quest for consensus does not lead us to establish an agenda in multilateral forums aimed at the adoption of secondary or partial disarmament measures.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall certainly bear in mind the statement made by our Mexican colleague and shall devote as much energy and attention as are required to carry out our mandate: the completion of the working groups' work - namely, Working Group I, which will have to finalize its work this year, and the other working groups, which will still have some time to go. We share in the endeavour to make this substantive session and future sessions as successful as possible. There is no doubt about that.

The next plenary meeting will take place on Monday, 11 May.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.169
13 May 1992

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 11 May 1992, at 11.25 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ERDOS (Hungary)

- Report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session
- Other business
- Concluding statements

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent, within one week of the date of this document, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

92-60633 8670V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: After three weeks of hard work, the Disarmament Commission is now approaching the final stage of its current session. In accordance with our programme of work, we shall take up agenda item 8 regarding the consideration and adoption of the reports of subsidiary bodies on the various substantive items and the draft report of the Commission to the General Assembly. Those reports are contained in documents A/CN.10/1992/CRP.2 to 6.

In accordance with the agreed programme of work we shall first adopt the report of the Commission as a whole and then hear concluding statements by delegations.

I intend to start with the consideration and adoption of the reports of the Commission's various subsidiary bodies on individual agenda items. I shall call on the Chairman of each Working Group in turn to introduce the report of his Working Group to the Commission.

We begin with the report of Working Group I, on agenda item 4 regarding objective information on military matters (A/CN.10/1992/CRP.3). I call on the Chairman of Working Group I, Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden, to introduce the report of the Group.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden), Chairman of Working Group I: I have the honour to introduce the report of Working Group I, on agenda item 4, entitled "Objective information on military matters". The report is contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.3.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Chairman, Working Group I)

Working Group I held 17 meetings between 22 April and 11 May 1992. Furthermore, I, as Chairman, conducted informal open-ended and private consultations during that period in order to promote agreement on the issues under deliberation in the Working Group.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Chairman, Working Group I)

At its first meeting, on 22 April, the Working Group agreed to take the 1991 Chairman's suggested text on guidelines for objective information on military matters as the basis for its work. That text was thereafter thoroughly discussed, and numerous proposals for amendments, deletions and additions were made. As a result, the text was reformulated to a very considerable extent.

It is a source of satisfaction for me to be in the position to report to the Commission that on 8 May the Working Group reached consensus on the guidelines and recommendations contained in the annex to the report.

The deliberations of the Working Group have taken place in a very positive atmosphere. I was privileged, as Chairman, to enjoy the cooperation of all delegations. The discussions were sometimes complicated and time-consuming, but it proved possible to find common ground on all the issues that were raised in the course of our work.

I have already had the opportunity to express my thanks to all delegations, to the members of the Secretariat and to my collaborators for the cooperation and support they extended to me during these weeks. May I, on this occasion, express my thanks also to you, Mr. Chairman, for your valuable support and for your own contribution to our work as Chairman of the Working Group last year. My thanks also go to its previous Chairman, Ambassador Peter Hohenfellner of Austria, for laying the basis for our work in its initial stage two years ago.

I should also like to take this opportunity to thank my fellow Working Group Chairmen for their understanding and cooperation in agreeing to allocate extra time to Working Group I in order to make it possible for it to complete its work in a successful manner.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Chairman, Working Group I)

At its 17th meeting, on 11 May, Working Group I adopted its report by consensus. I have the honour hereby to submit the report to the Disarmament Commission for its consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no comments, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report (A/CN.10/1992/CRP.3) of Working Group I on agenda item 4 regarding objective information on military matters.

The report was adopted.

Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan): I should like to convey my delegation's deep appreciation to Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden for the excellent manner in which he guided the work of Working Group I on objective information on military matters.

While my delegation, in a spirit of compromise and constructive cooperation, joined the consensus in the adoption of the report on guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters, we should like to place on record the following:

In the text which has just been adopted by consensus under the section dealing with "Principles", the chapeau paragraph states that Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter are particularly relevant to the provision of objective information on military matters. However, we would have preferred to see Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter listed in the text, owing to their special importance to the subject, which cannot be overemphasized, particularly the peaceful settlement of disputes and the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination.

Pakistan fully supports the concept of transparency in armaments, as long as, in our view, it simultaneously and comprehensively takes into account all

(Mr. Mahmood, Pakistan)

its related and integrally linked aspects, particularly the indigenous production capabilities of different States, as well as the legitimate security concerns of States, and helps in enhancing confidence-building between States, particularly at the regional level, with the ultimate objective of ensuring the equal and undiminished security of States at the lowest level of armaments.

The accumulation of armaments in various regions of the world is a result of a number of factors: unresolved territorial disputes, denial of the right to self-determination, ambitions of regional hegemony by States possessing military superiority and foreign occupation and military intervention.

Therefore, one of the most important issues to be addressed by the international community is the peaceful resolution of outstanding conflicts and disputes. Only thus will proposals for the provision of objective information on military matters and transparency in armaments succeed in their essential objective, and the process of regional and international peace and security be strengthened.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the report of Working Group II on agenda item 5, entitled "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons", as contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.4.

I call on the representative of India, to introduce the report of Working Group II on behalf of its Chairman, Ambassador Prakash Shah.

Mr. JAIN (India): It is my privilege, on behalf of His Excellency Ambassador Prakash Shah, Chairman of Working Group II, to introduce the report of the Group on its consideration of agenda item 5, entitled "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons". The report is contained in conference room paper A/CN.10/1992/CRP.4.

The Working Group held nine meetings. In carrying out its deliberations the Group had before it a number of working papers submitted by various delegations and documents as listed in paragraph 2 of the report.

As the Chairman mentioned in his first progress report to a plenary meeting of the Commission, the Group decided, at its second meeting, to base its work on the four subjects which had been agreed to at its previous session in 1991. Thereafter, the Group proceeded to discuss those four subjects; a core working group was charged with elaborating the third one. The Chairman has asked me to express his appreciation to the delegation of Egypt for discharging the responsibility of coordinating the core group's deliberations in an efficient and businesslike manner.

The debate on the four subjects was constructive and engendered much demonstrated interest. During the course of the discussions, the four subjects were further elaborated by the Group. The changed international climate provided the Group with a new setting to exchange views and perceptions on a wide variety of issues under the agenda item. Even though a divergence of views on major substantive issues continues, the focus on specific issues provides useful groundwork for the Group to aim at concluding its work successfully next year.

(Mr. Jain, India)

The elaboration of the four subjects has helped in identifying some aspects on which the Group may wish to focus in the future. The Working Group believes that the progress made during this year's session in identifying and elaborating the various interrelated elements under the four subjects should enable it, at next year's session, to work towards consensus-building to be reflected in its final report. The large number of working papers presented and statements made during the session not only reflect the high interest of member States in the subject of nuclear disarmament but should also contribute greatly to the Group's deliberations to continue next year.

The elaboration, which is annexed to the report of the Group, is not exhaustive. As the report itself underlines, the elaboration is without prejudice to the right of any delegation to address items which do not appear on it; its sequence is not reflective of priorities; and it does not prejudice the position of any delegation.

The Chairman believes that the discussion on this item has proved that nuclear disarmament remains the agreed highest priority for international peace and security. He commends the report for adoption by the Commission by consensus.

Ambassador Shah would like to express his deep appreciation to all delegations for their efforts, support and cooperation, both in informal consultations and in formal meetings, on this challenging subject. He expresses in particular his sincere thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, for your unreserved and sustained support of him in his work and to His Excellency, Mr. Amr Moussa, Foreign Minister of Egypt, for his stewardship of the Working Group last year, which laid the foundation for the significant progress achieved this year. Ambassador Shah further wishes to express his gratitude

(Mr. Jain, India)

to the Secretary of the Working Group, Ms. Jenifer Mackby, for her most valuable assistance, and to the interpreters and all other Secretariat staff who efficiently serviced our meetings.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no comments, may I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report (A/CN.10/1992/CRP.4) of Working Group II on agenda item 5 regarding nuclear disarmament?

The report was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the report of Working Group III on agenda item 6, entitled "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security", as contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.5.

I call on the representative of Peru, to introduce the report of Working Group III on behalf of its Chairman, Ambassador Ricardo Luna.

Mr. PAULINICH (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of the Chairman of Working Group III, Ambassador Ricardo Luna, I am pleased to introduce the report of the Group on agenda item 6, entitled "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security", contained in conference room paper A/CN.10/1992/CRP.5.

Working Group III held nine meetings between 22 April and 8 May. It also met once for informal consultations during that time. The Group exhaustively considered the first two topics of the document prepared by Ambassador Wisnumurti last year, in other words, "Relationship between regional disarmament and global security and arms limitation and disarmament", and "Principles and guidelines".

As a result of the consideration of these first two topics, the Chairman submitted two papers containing the status of the deliberations that were carried out and including a series of proposals put forward by various

(Mr. Paulinich, Peru)

delegations, which improved or updated the principles relevant to these two sections, as well as the formulation of new principles that have enriched the subject's consideration. Provisional agreements have been reached on most of the principles, and these will again be considered at the next session.

My delegation considers that important progress has been made since last year, on the understanding that the papers submitted by the Chairman include, as has already been mentioned, provisional agreements which should constitute the basis of next year's consideration.

My delegation would like to express its sincere appreciation for the active participation and spirit of cooperation of the delegations that attended the Group's deliberations. We also thank the Secretariat for its efforts in support of our work.

Lastly, my delegation takes this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the outstanding manner in which you have been conducting our work at this session.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments at this stage, I should like to take up the various amendments to this report that were indicated in the course of our previous discussions, without specifically mentioning them. I shall just indicate the places where these amendments should be inserted in the final text. In annex II of document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.5, we have amendments in paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 25.

If there is no comment, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report of Working Group III contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.5, as amended.

Mr. JAIN (India): With due regard - and I hope I am not quibbling about words, Mr. Chairman - when we come to adopting the report, could we not say we are adopting the report as "orally corrected", and not "as amended"? I think that is actually the case.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no difficulty in responding positively to the request of the representative of India. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report (A/CN.10/1992/CRP.5) of Working Group III on agenda item 6, "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security", as orally corrected.

The report, as orally corrected, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the report of Working Group IV on item 7, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", as contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.6.

I call on the representative of Nigeria, to introduce the report of Working Group IV on behalf of Ambassador Azikiwe.

Mr. FASEHUN (Nigeria): It is my privilege to introduce the report of Working Group IV on behalf of Ambassador Azikiwe.

Working Group IV was mandated to consider agenda item 7, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields". The report is in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.6. The Working Group held 10 meetings. Informal consultations were held under the guidance of Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada.

The report contains 8 paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 to 4 describe the procedure of the Working Group, including the election of officers, and the papers submitted, of which there were 13 in all. Paragraphs 5 to 8 contain the views of member States on the sub-items; scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security; science and technology for disarmament; the role of science and technology in other related fields; and the transfer of high technology with military applications. The debate in the Working Group was rich and diverse, indicative of progress, albeit small, on the discussion of the various sub-items. At its 10th meeting, Working Group IV adopted its report.

I wish to express the gratitude of Ambassador Azikiwe to Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada for her commendable role in presiding over the informal consultations. Nigeria also wishes to thank you, Mr. Chairman,

(Mr. Fasehun, Nigeria)

for your support and understanding. We also thank members of Secretariat for their cooperation and tireless service.

The report of Working Group IV is hereby submitted for consideration and approval.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like at this stage to indicate the amendments to be introduced into the text of the report.

At the bottom of page 1, under subparagraph (m), there is a modification to be made. On page 2, in paragraph 4, we have a change to be introduced. In the third subparagraph of paragraph 5, there is a change in the text, and in the fourth subparagraph, on page 3, we also have a slight change to be introduced. In paragraph 6, there is a change. In the third subparagraph of paragraph 8, on page 4, we have an amendment to introduce. On page 5, in the last subparagraph of paragraph 8, there were two proposals for amendments, which were accepted. There was also a general comment as regards the various working papers that were submitted, and this comment will also have to be reflected throughout the document. The Secretariat will take care of it.

If there are no comments, we can now proceed to the adoption of the report (A/CN.10/1992/CRP.6) of Working Group IV on item 7 regarding the role of science and technology in the field of disarmament. May I take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report, as orally corrected?

The report, as orally corrected, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now adopted the reports of the four subsidiary bodies of the Disarmament Commission. I should like to express, on behalf of the Bureau and the Secretariat, our thanks and appreciation to the Chairmen of the Working Groups for their endeavours in dealing with their tasks, for their dedication to the subjects, and for their cooperation in

(The Chairman)

successfully carrying out the tasks entrusted to the Commission by the General Assembly.

We are now in a position to take up the draft report of the Disarmament Commission for consideration, as contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.2.

I have the pleasure to call on the Rapporteur of the Commission, Mr. Bob Hiensch of the Netherlands, to introduce the draft report.

Mr. HIENSCH (Netherlands), Rapporteur of the Disarmament Commission: It is my honour and pleasure to introduce to the Disarmament Commission the draft report of the Commission on its current session, as contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.2, which is before members of the Commission for consideration.

In conformity with previous practice, the draft report contains four chapters: Introduction, Organization and work of the 1992 session, Documentation, and Conclusions and recommendations. As in previous years, the document presents a factual description of the Commission's work during this session. With regard to the substantive work done by the subsidiary bodies of the Commission, the relevant sections will contain the reports of the four Working Groups, which have just been adopted by the Commission.

As members may note, certain information has been left blank in the draft report at this stage. I propose that we leave it to the Secretariat to complete the text with meeting numbers and dates as appropriate.

At this point, the Secretariat has left me, in the Rapporteur's brief, exactly two lines for a personal assessment. I do not know whether it is within the tasks or competence of the Rapporteur to give an assessment of the Disarmament Commission's work, but I should like nevertheless to take the opportunity afforded to me. However, in view of the number of delegations

(Mr. Hiensch, Rapporteur, Disarmament Commission)

inscribed on the speaker's list, I shall be very brief and restrict myself to those two lines.

This session of the Disarmament Commission has in general been a successful one. There has been not only the positive conclusion of one agenda item, but also good progress on another one. On the other hand, there was a mixed result on other items on the agenda, which fell somewhat below my expectations. This means that, at next year's session of the Disarmament Commission, much work will remain to be done with the finalization of two, or even three, agenda items. In this respect, it is my impression that the experience of holding consecutive meetings was a positive one, and it could be continued next year.

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt thanks to the members of the Secretariat for the assistance and cooperation they provided to me in the preparation of the draft report of the Commission. In particular, I should like to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, and Mr. Davinic, Director of the Office for Disarmament Affairs. In addition, I wish to offer sincere thanks to Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, Secretary of the Commission, and his colleagues for their valuable assistance and cooperation.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize that it was a great honour and privilege for me to have served under your distinctive and effective leadership, and to have received the fullest cooperation of the Chairmen of the four Working Groups, who so ably guided the deliberations of the subsidiary bodies of the Commission during this session.

With this brief introduction, I now recommend that the Commission adopt the draft report.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now consider the draft report (A/CN.10/1992/CRP.2) of the Commission paragraph by paragraph. This is something of a ritual, and I ask members' indulgence.

Since there were no comments on paragraphs 1 to 14, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt those paragraphs.

Paragraphs 1 to 14 were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments on paragraph 15?

Mr. JAIN (India): Part III B of the draft report, paragraphs 15 to 24, refers to a purported list of the documents dealing with substantive questions that were submitted in the course of the Commission's work.

I do not know if this is a matter of practice, but I think the substantive aspect of the issue should be more important. There are a number of working papers dealing with substantive issues that were presented in the Working Groups during the session, and these are indeed listed in the reports of the Working Groups. But they are not listed here in paragraphs 16 to 24. Since the language of paragraph 15 does not even refer to those documents, I think it would be only appropriate to refrain from any unintended discrimination by implying that the paragraphs following paragraph 15 contain a comprehensive list of all the documents submitted during this year's session.

Working Groups are an integral part of the Disarmament Commission, so I do not think it is really necessary to make a distinction in the report between the papers submitted to the Commission itself and those submitted to the Working Groups.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. LIN Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Disarmament Commission): In response to the question raised by the representative of India, I wish to point out that the wording of paragraph 15 is the same as that adopted in previous years and accords precisely with previous practice.

In connection with the various documents listed, delegations will understand that all the documents submitted to a subsidiary body for the purpose of the work of that body are already listed in the report of that subsidiary body. Thus, all those documents will be duly reflected in the Commission's report. In Part III B, only documents submitted at the level of the Commission - those bearing an "A/CN.10" symbol - are listed. That is the general practice with regard to the report of the Commission.

Mr. JAIN (India): Mr. Lin indeed, has just kindly confirmed what I thought was the case: that this is a matter of practice.

The beginning part of paragraph 15 reads "In the course of the Commission's work...". That clearly implies that the Commission's work also includes the work of the Working Groups. The point is that we are making an unintended distinction between papers on substantive issues submitted to the Disarmament Commission itself and those submitted in the Working Groups. I hope it will be possible for the Commission to make the list more comprehensive and include all the documents in this Part, because those other documents too dealt with substantive questions and were submitted in the course of the Commission's work.

The CHAIRMAN: As we have heard, this is the practice we have followed thus far. Obviously, the Commission is master of its own proceedings, and if it wishes it can introduce any kind of change. We have simply to see whether or not we are willing to move in that direction. I

(The Chairman)

would obviously very much like to consult the Commission: shall we leave the text as it is, reflecting the practice of the last couple of years, or do we feel we are in a position to redraft a sentence? I am entirely in the hands of the Commission.

Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan): I would like clarification on one point. To what are we referring when we say "all the documents"? Are we referring to statements? Are we referring to informal papers?

The CHAIRMAN: Let me ask the representative of Pakistan where in the report he finds the words "all the documents"?

Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan): I was just responding to the statement made by the previous speaker; it is merely a point of clarification.

Mr. STEFANINI (France) (interpretation from French): I do not think the Commission should spend too much time on this matter; it is essentially an editorial matter. In the view of my delegation, the report should mention only documents formally submitted as documents of the Commission or of a Working Group, translated into all official languages and bearing the "A/CN.10" symbol; other papers that have been circulated should not be mentioned here.

We might base the wording of paragraph 15 on the French version, which is clearer than the English. It reads, "In the course of its work, the Commission had before it the following substantive documents," the Commission comprising, of course, the Commission itself meeting in plenary and all its Working Groups.

(Mr. Stefanini, France)

Hence I think the English version of paragraph 15 could be rewritten to say something like

(spoke in English)

"In the course of its work the documents listed below, dealing with substantive questions, were submitted to the Commission".

(spoke in French)

This would preserve the concept of the Commission and its working Groups. But as I am no Anglophone, I leave this to the discretion of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Frankly, I am not very enthusiastic about reopening a discussion on this sentence. We have the reports of the subsidiary working bodies and they mention the very many papers that were presented to the Working Groups. This morning we even expanded this listing because some members found that not all of them had been included in it, and so we now have another listing of the documents that were submitted to the Commission.

If we take the Disarmament Commission's report to the General Assembly as a whole - and that is the only way we can take it; there is no other way - we have every document that was presented to the Working Groups and to the Commission itself in a single comprehensive document. So, actually, we are not leaving out anything because, I repeat, the report has to be considered in its entirety and cannot be separated from its annexes and various other parts.

In this spirit, I am asking members whether we really are not in a position to accept the language in paragraph 15, with the clear understanding that conference room paper A/CN.10/1992/CRP.2 will include the texts of conference room papers A/CN.10/1992/CRP.3, 4, 5 and 6, thus constituting one single document.

I think that is a very logical approach which might gain us some time. I am referring to the list of speakers, which already contains 14 names. We are all interested in finishing the work of the Disarmament Commission today, after the hard work of the last three weeks.

Mr. JAIN (India): It was certainly not my intention to prolong or delay the conclusion of the work of the Commission. The representative of France stated that the list here contains documents which were formally submitted to the Disarmament Commission, and this is exactly the point which led to my suggestion, for we do not really think that the other documents that are not referred to here were submitted informally.

I would therefore propose, keeping in view your preference, Mr. Chairman, that we do not need to change the language of paragraph 15, or of any paragraphs up to paragraph 24, but that, after paragraph 24, we add one more paragraph before Part IV, the wording of which would read as follows:

"A number of other working papers dealing with substantive questions were also submitted by Member States in the Working Groups, which are referred to in the reports of the Working Groups."

It is a factual statement and the intent is to cover only what is not covered in the main report.

The CHAIRMAN: If I have understood our colleague from India correctly, I believe that we can add, after paragraph 24, an extra paragraph as read out by the representative of India - as a new paragraph 25, the remaining paragraphs in Part IV to be renumbered accordingly as paragraphs 26 to 31.

I suggest, therefore, that we leave paragraph 15 as it is and continue going through the document paragraph by paragraph.

If there are no comments on paragraphs 15 through 24, and on the new paragraph 25, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt those paragraphs.

Paragraphs 15 to 25 were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: May I also take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the renumbered paragraphs 26 to 31 in Part IV?

Paragraphs 26 to 31 were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Having adopted all paragraphs of the draft report, I should like to take up the draft report of the Commission as a whole, with all the reports of the subsidiary bodies inserted therein. May I take it that it is the wish of the Commission to adopt the draft report of the Commission as a whole, as contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.2?

The draft report, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 8.

OTHER BUSINESS

The CHAIRMAN: It appears that no delegation has indicated a desire to make a statement under this item. May I take it, therefore, that the Commission has concluded its consideration of the item?

It was so decided.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

The CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned earlier, thus far there are 14 names inscribed on the list of speakers wishing to make concluding statements. In order to make good use of the time available to the Commission this morning, we shall begin to hear the concluding statements now. If other delegations wish to speak, I urge them to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): It gives me great pleasure to convey to you, Mr. Chairman, the thanks and appreciation of my delegation, and my own, for the very efficient manner in which you have conducted our deliberations. I should also like to thank the members of the Secretariat for the most valuable assistance they provided to me as Chairman of Working Group I.

The 1992 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission is drawing to a close. I should therefore like to avail myself of this opportunity to make a few concluding remarks on behalf of my delegation.

The agenda and working methods of the Commission have, as we all know, recently been reviewed in order to make its work more effective. This year the Commission was to stand its first test under the new order, as it was requested by the General Assembly to conclude its deliberations on agenda item 4 in 1992. Many delegations, including my own, therefore attach particular importance to the outcome of the work of this agenda item.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

The question of objective information on military matters deserves great attention on its own merits, as the provision of such information is conducive to confidence- and security-building and disarmament. The experiences of the process within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) are indeed very encouraging in this regard.

Sweden has over the years promoted the idea of provision of objective information on military matters also in the context of the United Nations, inter alia, by submitting draft resolutions on the standardized reporting of military expenditures. Furthermore, Sweden has participated in, and on some occasions chaired, expert panels on this matter and has, of course, participated in the reporting itself. My country has also, through United Nations studies and in many other ways, supported the efforts to create greater openness and transparency in military matters and the role of the United Nations in this context.

The successful outcome of this year's work on agenda item 4 has an added dimension in that it demonstrates that it is possible to reach consensus in this truly universal body on substantive guidelines in the field of arms limitation and disarmament and related issues. This bodes well for the future.

The results of the deliberations in Working Groups II, III and IV are also a source of satisfaction and should form a good basis for the conclusion of the respective agenda items.

Looking ahead, it seems useful to request the United Nations Diarmament Commission to elaborate general guidelines also in other areas where it is essential to seek broad political consensus, such as in the field of non-proliferation. It is necessary to initiate an international dialogue in this topical issue area, and the Disarmament Commission would be an appropriate forum for such a dialogue.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

Some of the issues in the field of non-proliferation are certainly inherent in items which are already on the agenda of the Commission, but, in the view of my delegation, a comprehensive approach should be applied to this multi-faceted question. It needs to be discussed in depth and in all its aspects. This is why Sweden has proposed to inscribe the question of non-proliferation, with special emphasis on weapons of mass destruction, on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission.

My delegation is aware of the fact that another topic has also been proposed for inclusion in the agenda, and it would, therefore, be flexible as to the appropriate timing of including the new item proposed by Sweden. This matter is, of course, also related to the discussion about the number of items on the working agenda and the sequence of the initial, middle, or final stages of their consideration. However, in view of the urgent nature of the subject-matter, the decision to include the question of non-proliferation should be taken this year. The proposal has already been submitted at this session of the Disarmament Commission, in order to allow sufficient time for its consideration before a decision is to be taken this autumn. My delegation will be available for further consultations on this matter.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express the warm thanks of my delegation to those who have already supported our proposal.

Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say that the Disarmament Commission is concluding the work of its 1992 substantive session, under your guidance and leadership, amidst a general feeling of justifiable satisfaction.

We have successfully finalized the set of "Guidelines and recommendations for provision of objective information on military matters", in the framework of the new working methods outlined in the annex to General Assembly

(Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil)

resolution 44/119 C, on "Ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission". We have thus concluded the first substantive item on the working agenda of the Disarmament Commission for in-depth consideration for a period of three years. It proved to be a very successful test case. All delegations displayed a very constructive and flexible attitude, a fact that reflects the new atmosphere prevailing in this Commission. A special word of appreciation is in order for Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden, the dedicated Chairman of Working Group I, whose skill and untiring leadership were instrumental to the successful outcome of these endeavours, which built upon the groundwork which had been set forth in the two previous years by Ambassador Hohenfellner of Austria and by you, Mr. Chairman.

In Working Group II, there was a constructive and useful continuation of exchange of views on the "Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons". Although differences of perception on the subject still persist, the quickly evolving international scene provided the backdrop for a renewed exercise of collective reflection on the possible directions and pace of the process of nuclear disarmament. In this regard, my delegation would like to express its gratitude to Ambassador Prakash Shah of India, for the wise and even-handed manner in which he conducted the deliberations and for the valuable outline presented in the annex to the report of Working Group II, which will greatly help us in our future deliberations.

In Working Group III, significant progress was equally registered in the course of our deliberations this year, and a special word of recognition is in order for Ambassador Ricardo Luna of Peru, for the very pragmatic and skilful way in which he advanced the discussions on "Regional approach to disarmament

(Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil)

within the context of global security". The contents of the report of the Group will surely assist us in making further progress on this important item at our next session.

Finally, I should like to express my delegation's satisfaction at the important progress made by Working Group IV this year in its deliberations on "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", and with the constructive atmosphere in which discussions continued to be carried out. We are greatly indebted to Ambassador Azikiwe of Nigeria, for having agreed to be Chairman of this Working Group, which is in its second year of fulfilling a complex, wide-ranging and challenging mandate, encompassing matters that had never before been dealt with in a systematic debate in the United Nations. We also wish to take this opportunity to express our gratitude for the very constructive role played by Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada, as a friend of the Chair, in performing the challenging task of putting together the draft report on this year's deliberations.

By adopting for the second year a substantive report on its work, Working Group IV has demonstrated the seriousness with which it is approaching the complex task of building consensus on this important agenda item. The cautious step-by-step approach followed by the Working Group throughout the two initial years of deliberations has already resulted in a few important consensual principles contained in this year's report, which will serve as foundations for further recommendations to be finalized next year, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 46/38 D.

(Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil)

On sub-item I, on the question of "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", there was agreement on a number of aspects: it was generally recognized that international security as such depends on a multiplicity of factors in the social, economic, environmental as well as the military field; there was a consensus that science and technology per se were deemed to be neutral and their application for peaceful purposes should be promoted; and it was agreed that the application of science and technology for legitimate defence purposes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and generally agreed principles of international law was acceptable.

(Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil)

On the sub-item on science and technology for disarmament, progress was made in identifying areas in which science and technology can be usefully applied for such disarmament tasks as weapons disposal, conversion and verification. There was consensus that international cooperation in this regard needed to be strengthened, that access to disarmament-related technologies was of particular relevance, and that efforts should be increased to develop concrete recommendations.

On sub-item 3, on the role of science and technology in other related fields, it was pointed out that a number of conclusions and recommendations contained in the study entitled "Charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment" might be relevant to the Group's work. The question of the utilization of scientific and technological resources currently applied to military purposes for the promotion of economic and social development was also addressed.

On sub-item 4, on the transfer of high technology with military applications, the Working Group continued its consideration of the proposal presented last year by Argentina and Brazil for seeking universally acceptable international norms or guidelines that would regulate international transfers of senstitive technologies. In this respect, there was consensus in the Group on two very important points: first, "the need to widen multilateral dialogue was recognized"; and, secondly, it was agreed that:

> "norms or guidelines for the transfer of high technology ... should take into account the legitimate requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, while ensuring that they do not deny access to high technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes" (A/CN.10/1992, CRP.6, para. 8).

(Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil)

Moreover, a number of relevant observations made by delegations was collected by the Chairman, on his own initiative, concerning the objectives of such a multilateral dialogue; the objectives of export control measures taken by some supplier States; the relationship between the multilateral dialogue and existing arrangements; the question of the legitimacy of partial regimes and universal regimes; the question of universally acceptable norms or guidelines that would regulate transfers of sensitive technology in order to seek the adherence of the greatest possible number of States both on the side of supply and on that of demand; the stake of all States in the strengthening of international peace and security as well as in facilitating legitimate international exchanges in the field of high technology, thus positively affecting international trade and economic and social development; the need for improved modalities to guarantee the transfer and utilization of dual-use technology exclusively for peaceful or legitimate defense purposes; and, finally, the improvement or development of mechanisms for international cooperation, on a bilateral, regional or multilateral basis.

Working Group IV expressed interest in continuing to make progress on this sub-item by further focusing the work at the 1993 session of the Disarmament Commission. Taking as a basis the above-mentioned elements and others contained in relevant documents submitted by delegations, it is our hope that the Working Group will be able successfully to proceed with the multilateral dialogue on this subject and finalize the elaboration of a set of guidelines on the international transfer of sensitive technologies. Brazil looks forward to participating in a constructive manner in the further deliberations of the Commission on this and other subjects.

(Mr. Araujo Castro, Brazil)

Finally, we should like to express our recognition of the skill and the qualities of leadership with which you, Ambassador Erdös, have conducted the work of the Disarmament Commission at its 1992 substantive session.

Mr. MORRIS (Australia): A few years ago, Australia joined with a number of other concerned delegations to press for change in the way the Disarmament Commission operated. At that time, it was clear that fundamental changes were under way in the international security environment. It was clear that the Disarmament Commission was preoccupied with an outmoded agenda and drowning itself in sterile debate. It was clear that the Disarmament Commission was fast becoming irrelevant in a changing world.

Australia was grateful for the response to our call for change and we welcomed the reform package which subsequently was agreed. With this package, we were able "to report out" items which had been debated for years without resolution, and we were able to settle on a shorter, four-item agenda more attuned to the concerns of the day.

Three years on, it seems useful to consider whether the Disarmament Commission really is now more in tune with the "real" world outside these walls; to consider whether our work methods are the most appropriate to fulfil the tasks we have set ourselves; and to consider what additional changes, if any, might be necessary to ensure that the Commission functions in the most effective way poassible. I propose to do this in two ways: first by looking at our work practices, and then by considering the substance of our agenda.

Under our new procedures, items on our agenda are given a maximum "shelf life" of three years. Of course, it was originally intended that if items could be concluded earlier than the three years it would be so much the better. The reality, however, seems to be that all items will run their three-year maximum term. This creates some management problems.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

We have now reported out one of our four original items and, under current arrangements, next year we should expect to conclude our consideration of the other three. Given the amount of time required this year to conclude our consideration of the objective information item, it has to be asked whether it will be practical, let alone possible, for similar time and resources to be allocated next year to three items, not to forget that there is also an expectation that we should begin consideration of a new item to replace objective information.

Last week, Sir, you outlined possible ways of approaching this problem. We will reflect carefully on your suggestions on ways to resolve our difficulties, and we will look forward to participating in a more formal exchange on the issue later in the year. In the meantime, as we all try to think through the problem, it might serve us all well to recall that, when we agreed to restrict our new agenda to no more than four items, we did not set a minimum number for consideration. Perhaps we should be thinking in terms of a three-point agenda to narrow our focus and to ensure a more concentrated and effective pattern of work.

We should also think about the reporting out of items. I have expressed concern about the prospect of reporting out three items at one session. Perhaps we should think about staggering the conclusion of items. This would require some adjustments to currently agreed arrangements. For example, next year one item might be set aside for a year, so that only two items need to be reported out. Repeating this process for a further year would then ensure a regular pattern of reporting out only one item thereafter each year. These thoughts we offer only to stimulate thinking, and we will continue to reflect on this ourselves.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

I should now like to focus on the work pattern of the Working Groups. Assuming that each Group will proceed on a three-year cycle, it seems sensible to consider how best to make this work, particularly now that we have had some practical experience with the process and have established some standards against which we can measure both positive and negative aspects of our work to date.

Clearly, while each Working Group will have a pace and dynamic of its own, and prospects for easily reaching consensus or otherwise will be directly related to the difficulty, complexity or contentiousness of the particular item, we do believe that there are characteristics common to the work of all Working Groups. For any Group, the first year's work clearly should be one for a wide-ranging exchange of views, circulation of working papers and other national contributions. The overriding objective should be to ensure that all views and all relevant information is placed on the table, as it were.

For this to be done purposefully and effectively, it will be essential for agreement quickly to be reached on a framework for the discussion. Indeed, this framework will be of critical importance to the work to be done in the following years, not least because it should have a determining influence on the structure of the Disarmament Commission's final report on the item.

Last year, Ambassador Wisnumurti of Indonesia provided an excellent example of how the process I have outlined could be put into practice. He put considerable effort into pre-Disarmament Commission consultations to establish parameters for agreement for a framework. This helped facilitate speedy agreement on a framework once the Disarmament Commission had begun its formal sessions.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

His report as Chairman too was something of a model for future groups. Time prevented any rationalizing or reordering of the points he drew from the general debate or that were provided to him by delegations, but we think that was a task more appropriate to be handled by the successor Chairman. In any event, capitals need time to absorb and respond to new ideas and issues, and we see this as being provided in the period between sessions of the Commission. This underlines the importance of ensuring, to the extent possible, that national positions are spelled out with maximum clarity during the first year's debate.

That is not to suggest that the second-year Chairman should simply pick up where his or her predecessor left off. That would be intellectually remiss. We elect our Chairmen for the contribution we believe they can make to facilitate our progress. And as far as my delegation is concerned, this means we expect an incoming Chairman - while respecting the structure and any common understandings agreed the previous year - to be prepared to take risks and, where he or she judges appropriate, to reformulate contributions from the previous year in terms he or she judges might help bridge differing positions. Our Chairman should be proactive, and with the able assistance of the Secretariat should be prepared to generate as many working papers as is necessary to stimulate and facilitate the work of the groups. Otherwise we would inevitably find ourselves spending the session reinventing phrases and formulations of the previous year. Inevitably we would become bogged down in unproductive work-games. Inevitably we would risk losing the year.

What we should aim for at the end of Year Two, and what our Chairman should focus his or her efforts on, is a substantive text containing as much agreed language as possible and producing as solid a basis as possible for the

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

final year's work. Our Chairman must be prepared to bring energy and commitment to the task.

Ambassador Hyltenius has provided us with a role model for the "reporting-out" year; I hardly need to say more on this.

None the less, when we come to the third and final year we should in particular keep in mind what is the role and function of the Disarmament Commission. The Disarmament Commission is a deliberative body the function of which is to consider and make recommendations on disarmament issues of particular concern to the international community. In so far as is possible, it is enjoined to adopt by consensus substantive decisions or recommendations.

That injunction to seek consensus sometimes puts us in difficult positions because of the widely varying views of countries on a number of the priority disarmament issues. We accept, however, because logic and common sense dictate it, that in a deliberative body such as the Disarmament Commission recommendations that do not enjoy consensus will be of little value since there will be no universal willingness to implement them. It is in this particular respect that the Disarmament Commission differs from, for example, the First Committee of the General Assembly, where it is quite natural, if consensus cannot be found, to take votes on draft resolutions, all of which usually contain recommendations.

I am focusing on the declaratory nature of the First Committee versus the deliberative nature of the Disarmament Commission because that difference is very important. If it did not exist there would be no reason to duplicate, in the United Nations, the work of the First Committee.

Another equally important point is that if the Disarmament Commission is qualitatively different from the First Committee in that its single goal is

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

consensus recommendations, then we should work in it in a manner which is oriented towards effectively fulfilling that objective.

That brings me back to where I began. Reform of the Disarmament Commission will succeed only if we, the members of the Commission, allow it to do so. National positions cannot be forcefully altered, and divergencies of view must be respected. But looking back over this year's work I think that greater effort than was at times applied during this session must be made at future sessions to bridge differences. We must focus on the possible rather than emphasizing the impossible, and we must continually look to keeping our efforts in tune with the world outside, casting off the dogma of years past.

I turn now to the substance of this year's agenda.

In Working Group I, on objective information, the achievement of a consensus text on guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters is a landmark for the Disarmament Commission. It shows that concrete results are possible in this forum and should contribute to an enhanced atmosphere for multilateral disarmament negotiations more generally in the future.

The adoption of that document is also another important step in the process of increasing transparency in military matters, which will contribute significantly to confidence-building and international security generally. Australia is particularly pleased with the references in the text to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. The further development of the Register is recommended in this document.

With respect to Working Group II, this has been a momentous 12 months in the process of nuclear disarmament. Not least, we have seen the reductions in nuclear weapons announced by the Russian Federation and the United States, and the moratoriums by the Russian Federation and France on nuclear tests.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

Clearly we are now seeing tangible steps, albeit tentative ones, towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, and we are heartened by this.

These developments were reviewed favourably under item 2 of the Working Group's agenda, and represented one of the areas where there was convergence of thinking. We were pleased that the Working Group was able quickly to agree on the structure of its work and its report, and in doing so building on our suggested structure last year and taking this item an additional step forward this year. Given the divergence of views on the nuclear issue, we congratulate Ambassador Shah on this achievement.

None the less, it is disappointing that the nuclear item could not progress much further from its general-debate mode. Undoubtedly, this is a reflection of the concerns of the international community about the possession and possible proliferation of nuclear weapons. If we are to be in a position meaningfully "to report out" this item, it will not be helpful for States to cling to cold-war rhetoric. We must try harder to develop new language which will build on and reinforce the positive steps which have been taken in recent years.

With respect to Working Group III on regional disarmament, I cannot conceal the disappointment of my delegation at the relative lack of progress in this Working Group this year. After such a promising beginning last year, by any measure this year's progress has been modest to say the least. The issue of regional disarmament is too important to my delegation - indeed to all of us - to deserve such handling.

But rather than focus on what was not achieved I prefer to look forward to see how the situation can be retrieved next year, when we are due to finalize our consideration of the item.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

We have a sound structure for the item, developed last year. Most if not all of the issues involved are to be found, albeit in unpolished form, in last year's paper, and a few additional points have emerged from our discussions this year.

The challenge for next year, then, is to see how all of this can be assembled in consensus language and in a form that will promote positively the concept and reality of regional disarmament. If we had the time, we could pick up where we left off this year, but we do not. Clearly, this will be one item in particular that will benefit from some advance work by the Chairman-elect. My delegation will be pleased to work with him or her to help ensure that rapid progress can be made on the item and a successful outcome assured.

Last year when we reviewed the outcome of the work of Working Group IV, on science and technology, we felt that its report would be a good basis on which to proceed this year. This optimism was confirmed when the Working Group was able quickly to reach agreement to use the four sub-items suggested last year as the basis for the Group's deliberations and eventual report.

The papers presented last year and this year have given next year's Working Group a solid basis from which "to report out" this item.

We are particularly grateful to Abassador Mason of Canada for agreeing to assist the Chairman in stitching together the principles in this year's report. This was not an easy task given the unexpected debate which developed at the drafting stage, particularly on issues which received little attention during the substantive meetings.

(Mr. Morris, Australia)

The second year of the newly functioning Disarmament Commission is now all but behind us. It is a session that has been marked with disappointments, with some encouraging results, and crowned with one particular success, thanks to the efforts of Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden.

My statement today has focused mainly on structure and institutional arrangements for the Disarmament Commission. When we adopted the reform package for this body, all of us were unsure whether the reality would measure up to our hopes. Certainly my delegation believes that the Disarmament Commission has now been set on a more productive and relevant path than hitherto. Certainly we believe that its more focused and compact agenda is now much more in tune with the world today. But we do see room for further refinements and further changes in our work habits.

Last year I observed that some delegations appeared to be having difficulties in shrugging off, as I said, "old think", and continued to work in ways inconsistent with the great changes under way in the international climate. This year the "internal climate", if it can so be characterized, has been far more positive, and we welcome this.

The Disarmament Commission is now beginning to show a potential we had thought was all but lost. But much remains to be done. Our work habits need to be kept under continued review and we need constantly to ensure that we do not allow the "new look" Disarmament Commission to revert to an ivory tower of babble.

Finally, may I extend the thanks of my delegation to you, Mr. Chairman, to the officers of the Commission, and not least to the members of the Secretariat, for helping us to make the progress that we did this year.

Mr. COOK (New Zealand): I should like to offer some brief comments about this year's meeting and about the future work programme of the Commission. Before doing so, may I first extend to you, Mr. Chairman, my congratulations on the able way in which you have overseen our discussions of the past weeks.

New Zealand was among those counries that strongly supported measures to streamline the Disarmament Commission's agenda. We believe that reducing the number of topics considered by the Commission and setting a fixed time-frame for their discussion would contribute to the effectiveness of this body. It seems an appropriate point in the cycle of items to take stock of any lessons that can be drawn from our experience so far of how these changes have operated in practice.

This year's session has rightly focused particular attention on the item on objective information, which is the first item on our new agenda to be taken to completion. I should at the outset acknowledge the debt of gratitude I feel we all owe to the Chairman of Working Group I, Ambassador Hyltenius, for his tireless and constructive efforts to steer us towards the completion of a consensus report.

The objective for my delegation on this item was the completion of a report which gave general endorsement to the important principle of greater openness and transparency on military matters and which set out some realistic guidelines to this end. We are sure that the final report, while of course it contains a number of compromises, none the less constitutes a valuable contribution to efforts to promote the provision of objective information on military matters.

(Mr. Cook, New Zealand)

While this exercise was not an easy one, we consider that the final outcome underlines the role the Disarmament Commission can play in promoting practical and concrete disarmament and confidence-building measures. I think our experience in Working Group I also underlines the need for the Commission to concentrate its efforts on specific proposals which are likely to attract consensus.

It is clear that issues which have caused difficulty for delegations in other forums are unlikely to be resolved in the course of the Disarmament Commission's session. It is also important, I suggest, that our recommendations should, as far as possible, be forward-looking and should contain realistic ideas that can be taken further by Member States, either bilaterally or multilaterally.

Working Group II dealt with an issue of particular concern to my delegaton. We found the wide-ranging exchange of views on various aspects of nuclear disarmament to be valuable and stimulating. There was general recognition of the historic changes that have taken place since our meeting a year ago, both in terms of specific arms control measures and, perhaps even more importantly, the new international climate now prevailing. At the same time, not unexpectedly, it was clear that on some issues we are a long way from consensus.

We are pleased that, despite these clear differences of view, the debate remained constructive. We therefore consider that the report prepared by Ambassador Shah provides a valuable summary of the issues raised and sets out in a helpful way the agreed structures for future work.

(Mr. Cook, New Zealand)

Looking ahead, my delegation considers that it will be essential to focus future work particularly on those aspects where a measure of agreement can be found. My delegation has made some specific suggestions for building on existing material, such as the nuclear-weapons study, and we hope these ideas will be of help in future consideration of this item.

In Working Group III some progress was made in identifying general propositions applying to the field of regional disarmament. The revised Chairman's paper (A/CN.10/1992/WG.III/CRP.3/Rev.1) annexed to the report incorporates both formulations that evolved in the course of discussions and some proposals that were raised but not discussed in any detail. Clearly, we still have some way to go before we arrive at an agreed text. Next year, while completing a reading of the remaining sections of the Chairman's text, we will also have to review the overall structure of the document we are seeking to produce.

Turning to the work of Working Group IV this year a number of thought-provoking working papers on science and tehnology were presented. The content of these papers demonstrate the vast array of issues that this item encompasses. We are particularly pleased to see the growing recognition which is reflected in this year's report of the Working Group of the important contribution that science and technology can make in the field of disarmament. The ongoing dialogue on the transfer of high technology with military applications has been useful in identifying the range of different views on this subject.

In conclusion, I should say that New Zealand will be studying carefully the suggestions that have been advanced for a further rationalization of our

(Mr. Cook, New Zealand)

future work programme. We have taken on board the argument that on the basis of this year's experience it would be an immensely difficult undertaking to attempt to bring three full items to a final conclusion in the same year. We are therefore attracted to the idea that our schedule should be adjusted to enable the Commission's workload to be spread more evenly so that each item can be given the attention it requires. We look forward to exploring these options in more detail with other delegations before a decision is taken on our future work programme later this year.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.170
14 May 1992

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 11 May 1992, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ERDOS (Hungary)

- Concluding statements (continued)
- Statement by the Chairman
- Closure of the session

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent, within one week of the date of this document, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

92-60639 8684V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Disarmament Commission, having adopted its report and begun hearing concluding statements, at its plenary meeting this morning, is now in the final stage of its work for the 1992 substantive session. I shall now call on those other representatives who also wish to make concluding statements.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I shall make my statement on behalf of the delegations of the Nordic countries - Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Finland.

One week ago, on 4 and 5 May, the Foreign Ministers of the Nordic countries met in order to discuss various matters of common interest and concern, as they do three times a year. At the end of their meeting, held this time in Helsinki, they issued a joint statement on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As many of the issues dealt with in the Nordic Foreign Ministers' statement are of great relevance to the work of this Commission, the Nordic delegations wish to draw the attention of other delegations to this important statement. I shall now highlight the few points made by the Nordic Foreign Ministers in their statement.

In their statement, they expressed their strong support for international treaties that ban or limit the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and for international export controls of missile technology and products that can be used in the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction. They called for a further strengthening of multilateral cooperation to this end. The Ministers emphasized that Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan should join the non-proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States as soon as possible.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

The Ministers also stressed the need for progress in limiting and controlling the international trade in conventional weapons through negotiations between exporting countries. The Ministers also expressed their support for regional efforts towards stability in arms control, for example, in the Middle East, Central Asia and Latin America. The full text of the statement is available to interested delegations at the back of this conference room.

Before concluding, let me now take this opportunity to say, on behalf of my own delegation, a few words about the work of the Disarmament Commission this year. A key issue this year was, of course, objective information on military matters. Success or failure there was a test-case for the reformed Disarmament Commission as a whole. Although we would have been happier had the Commission endorsed the necessity of openness in military matters in a most forthright manner, we are none the less happy to see that it passed the test by adopting a substantive text by consensus. The text contains pertinent observations and recommendations without compromising fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, as enshrined in the Charter. My delegation congratulates the Chairman of Working Group I, Ambassador Hyltenius, for a job well done.

The work of the other Working Groups proceeded much as expected. Useful work was done on the science and technology item. We are, however, disappointed that so little was achieved on the regional disarmament item, to which we attach particular importance.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

Working Group III should focus on producing a limited number of uncluttered, forward-looking guidelines of use in advancing regional disarmament in various parts of the world. Undue concentration on references to past documents and on all manner of qualifiers and preconditions will not carry the work forward.

Finally, I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the extended Bureau for the tireless efforts expended in our common cause.

Mr. JARAMILLO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Let me express my delegation's satisfaction at having been able, Sir, to rely on your skilful and distinguished guidance as Chairman of the Commission. We also congratulate your fine associates, the other Commission officers and the Secretariat staff, for whose cooperation and dedicated work we are most grateful.

Today, the question of international arms transfers has assumed priority on the United Nations agenda. Widespread ethnic, subregional and regional conflicts highlights the urgency of that question. The most important of those conflicts, the Gulf war, compels us to reflect on its origin, its consequences and the responsibility of each party.

It cannot be denied that the excessive accumulation of weapons in that region fomented a devastating war. Had there existed a code of international conduct on arms transfers, that war would not have taken place or would at least have been on a smaller scale. The same could be said of other past and present conflicts, fuelled, encouraged and exacerbated both by so-called legal and by illicit arms transfers.

Judging from statements by Heads of State or Government - which we assume are begining to constitute a new code of ethics and a new way of regarding

(Mr. Jaramillo, Colombia)

this gruesome commerce - we can begin to hope that the countries that manufacture, sell and export weapons will take steps leading to a serious and responsible management of the production of weapons and their transfer to other countries.

One of those steps is the anticipated broadening of the Register of Conventional Arms established in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L to make it non-discriminatory and universal. No less urgent and important are the steps the international community must take by the terms of resolution 46/36 H, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly; that resolution, inter alia, sets out various measures to prevent and ultimately to eliminate illicit arms trafficking.

There is no need to repeat what my delegation has said repeatedly about the evil effects of a clearly illicit trade whose objective it is to alter the constitutional order and the peace of the countries to which the weapons come, and which continues to undermine the efforts towards peace we are pursuing with such sacrifice and such hope both in our region and in other areas of conflict.

But we cannot remain silent in the face of this traffic in death and devastation that strikes at our dignity and sovereignty under the impassive gaze of the countries that produce and sell these weapons. It is true that these weapons represent lucrative earnings for the producer countries and the businesses that manufacture and sell them, but for our peoples they mean only blood, desolation and misery. Respect and concern for the security of the various regions of the world will have to become more important than the money involved here, if the lofty principles of the Charter are ever to be realized. I can only say that the measures set out in resolution 46/36 H cannot be postponed.

(Mr. Jaramillo, Colombia)

Although there have been other important proposals on non-proliferation, my delegation calls on the States here participating in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission to consider without delay the need to consider at the Commission's next session the various measures set out in resolution 46/36 H so that at the 1992 organizational session the issue of international arms transfers will be included on the agenda of the 1993 substantive session in accordance with paragraph 10 of that resolution. That would make a decisive contribution to translating the goal of strengthing international peace and security into concrete, effective measures and instruments, rather than into today's hollow rhetoric.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): Before beginning the formal part of my statement, I should like to carry out a no less formal and important duty, which is to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the Bureau for the tremendous work you have done in running the Disarmament Commission this year. I should like especially to mention the patience and good humour with which you have carried out your onerous duties. This comes as no surprise to the Irish delegation, given your personal merits and those of the grand country you represent.

The purpose of the present intervention by the delegation of Ireland is to attempt to draw conclusions from the 1992 session and to set a context and perhaps seek a point of perspective for the work of the Disarmament Commission in the future. It is not that the Irish have any special qualifications in relation to the issues I have mentioned. However, as a nation we prefer to look at the wood in its entirety rather than at each individual tree. From this viewpoint we think there is always a danger when bureaucrats gather together of, as my countryman James Joyce put it in Finnegans Wake, "dislocated reason".

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

The first point to underline is that this is a deliberative and not a negotiating body. Therefore, the essence of our work is to deliberate and if possible to think. It seems to me that we have been rather successful at these aspects of our work. I do not seek to diminish the value of arriving at agreed papers to give shape, so to speak, to the product and to market it intelligently to the consumer. That is important; nevertheless, we must not, in the pursuit of the appropriate wrapping material, neglect the quintessential product.

In that context, what we have achieved during this session of the Disarmament Commission is significant. We have managed to finalize the issue of objective information on military matters. The pessimists, and even the occasional optimist, may object that we could have achieved more. We certainly could. But it is not always possible to achieve perfection. We have done a good, if not a perfect, day's work, in my opinion.

The Working Group on nuclear disarmament also made significant progress in drawing up an outline of its future document. Several significant contributions were made both orally and by way of written submissions. My delegation will be forgiven, I hope, for taking a particular pleasure in having presented our own working paper on nuclear disarmament issues and a general pleasure in having been part of the team of the 12 member States of the European Community who also presented a working paper on nuclear disarmament issues. That working paper, as the representative of the presidency of the European Community said in introducing it, represents our common views. Its very existence makes a point of fundamental political importance, namely that, while we can and must diverge, we can and must also converge. Useful progress was also made in the two remaining Working Groups, which are scheduled to complete their work next year.

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

I need to ask, then, why I detect that people remain somewhat uncomfortable with the results of this year's session of the Disarmament Commission. If we were to look at it in terms of clear, concise and rational achievement, perhaps the results we have achieved are disappointing. Sometimes, the results of our endeavours, even when we get roughly what we want, can be disappointing; sometimes, our aims, once implemented, do not live up to the expectations we hold for them. Acknowledging this, I see little else wrong with our way of work given that we are a deliberative body. The results we have achieved reflect the reality outside these halls.

As to the immediate future, my delegation's view is that we should seek to conclude next year our discussion of regional disarmament and science and technology. We feel that the issue of nuclear disarmament could benefit from more prolonged discussion. We consider it would be useful, therefore, to continue our deliberations on this issue next year with a view to concluding them, with an agreed document, in 1994.

My delegation notes the proposal by Sweden to inscribe the question of non-proliferation with special emphasis on weapons of mass destruction on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. The issue of non-proliferation is one to which Ireland attaches major importance, and we would be very glad to join in any consultations which may take place on this issue.

It is important in our deliberations not to replace the cold war rhetoric and its certainties with new gods of certainty. Having pensioned off, so to speak, the old gods, we ought to ensure that the new ones are a little more tolerant. In that context, since I set out to introduce a sense of perspective into our deliberations and said that the Irish had no special

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

gifts in this area, let me end by quoting a man who does have a sense of perspective. Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev spoke many words of wisdom in a recent speech. The wisdom of the author and of his words call attention to themselves and do not need me to do so. Nevertheless, I think that some of those words could help us to achieve a sense of balance. My delegation therefore has the honour, in concluding, to read some of the words of Mikhail Gorbachev into the records of the Commission.

"We live today in a watershed era. One epoch has ended and a second is commencing. No one yet knows how concrete it will be - no one. Having long been orthodox Marxists, we were sure that we knew. But life once again has refuted those who claim to be know-it-alls and Messiahs."

Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America): As this year's substantive session of the Disarmament Commission comes to a close, permit me, first of all, to say how much my delegation appreciates the stewardship you, Mr. Chairman, have provided in the course of the session. In performing your functions you have once again demonstrated your high personal and professional qualities so well known to all those of us who have had the pleasure and privilege to work with you on earlier occasions. My delegation is also grateful for the contributions to the Commission's work by the other members of the Bureau and by those who carried the heavy burden of guiding our day-to-day deliberations, the Chairmen of the Working Groups.

In providing assistance to the Commission, members of the Office of Disarmament Affairs displayed during this session their usual professionalism and efficiency. Their efforts are greatly appreciated by my delegation, as are those of the interpreters and other Secretariat staff without whose support the Commission could not function.

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

My delegation is gratified that this session has succeeded in completing item 4 on its agenda, "Objective information on military matters", by achieving consensus on a document entitled "Guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters". This important result was made possible by the spirit of cooperation and compromise prevailing in Working Group I, but also in no small measure by the dedication and untiring efforts of that Group's Chairman, Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden. My delegation, as we are sure do all others, deeply appreciates the fairness, patience and purposefulness with which he handled his by no means easy task. We are also indebted to you, Mr. Chairman, and to Ambassador Hohenfellner of Austria for laying a good foundation for this year's work on this subject in chairing the Working Group respectively in 1991 and 1990.

The United States firmly believes that openness and transparency in military matters increase confidence among nations and thus can contribute to international stability and security. We had hoped, therefore, that the Commission would produce an endorsement of the provision of objective information on military matters that was not as heavily caveated as the one adopted this morning. It is true, of course, that legitimate national security considerations impose certain limits on the extent of military information that can be divulged. The document, as adopted, recognizes that. But, in our opinion, it also tends to make provision of such information conditional on too many other factors. In fact, it even contains some internal contradictions. For example, it states that all States have the duty to provide objective information on military matters, but also suggests that provision of such information could constitute intervention or interference in the internal affairs of States - a notion which is difficult to understand and

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

accept. Nevertheless, the United States views the overall document as a positive step, one that, along with General Assembly resolution 46/36 L on transparency in armaments, may lead to the eventual recognition by all States of the contribution openness and transparency can make to stability at all levels - internal, regional and global.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, my delegation would now like to make a few brief observations on the deliberations which took place in the other three Working Groups.

As regards Working Group II, dealing with nuclear disarmament issues, we welcome the practically unanimous acknowledgement in that Group of the important strides made by the United States and Russia in the area of nuclear arms reductions. We also appreciate that many delegations shared our concern about the nuclear weapons still remaining in several newly independent States that were parts of the former Soviet Union. On the other hand, while we welcome the improvement in the atmosphere in this Group, we regret that on most issues of substance the deliberations indicated a continued and widespread unwillingness to adjust traditional positions to new realities.

We are deeply disappointed that so little progress was made in Working Group III, which deliberated on regional disarmament issues. In part, the Group's failure to advance in its work may have been due to the structure of its proceedings. The fundamental reason, however, in our view, was that the positions of a number of delegations continued to consist of what the delegation of Finland in its opening statement on 20 April so aptly described, and deplored, as fossilized ideas. Some apparently refuse to admit that the world has dramatically changed since 1978 and that their approach of making their own participation in the process of arms limitation or reduction

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

conditional on global disarmament is no longer sustainable, if it ever was. We have noted with satisfaction, however, a gradual evolution towards greater realism in the positions of an increasing number of delegations and hope that this trend will continue at a more rapid pace.

With regard to Working Group IV, on science and technology, my delegation welcomes the moderate progress we made in advancing our deliberations and further defining the issues at hand. This topic is now two years old, and yet it remains a new one for the United Nations - a topic in which the views and perspectives are wide ranging and diverse.

My delegation is optimistic that in the final year of this topic, next year, we might be able to make some progress in further identifying areas for common ground and possible recommendations. In particular, we are very pleased that all delegations recognize the importance of science and technology for disarmament. We believe that additional progress can be made in identifying areas in which disarmament-related science and technology is applied, including weapons disposal and destruction, military conversion, and the negotiation and verification of disarmament agreements.

Finally, my delegation will continue to welcome a dialogue on issues related to controlling exports and use of technologies with military applications, especially as this dialogue could strengthen existing non-proliferation arrangements by bringing about a better appreciation of, and increased participation in, those arrangements.

(Mr. Akalovsky, United States)

The experience of this session, where we concluded only one item on the Disarmament Commission agenda, has given us a clear signal that the resources of delegations, especially smaller ones, will be highly strained next year when three agenda items are scheduled for conclusion. Moreover, there will be a high demand on the time and facilities available for Working Group meetings.

We are aware that you, Mr. Chairman, have already given thought to this problem. For our part, we believe that, since there is no requirement for the Disarmament Commission to have four items on its agenda, the simplest and perhaps most practical way to alleviate the problem would be in not replacing the objective information item with a new one this year. We are looking forward to the consultations you plan to hold between now and the 1993 Disarmament Commission organizational session in December of this year, when appropriate decisions will have to be taken.

Mr. SEIM (Norway): I have asked to speak at this final plenary meeting to make a few observations. However, let me first express our appreciation for the way in which you have guided our deliberations, Mr. Chairman.

This year's session of the Disarmament Commission has taken place in a good atmosphere and in a spirit of constructive cooperation. The discussions have, to a large extent, been result-oriented. My delegation is encouraged that the reform package adopted in 1990 has strengthened the role of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body for considering and making recommendations on proposals in the field of disarmament.

The conclusion of the agenda item on objective information on military matters is most promising. The adoption of the report by consensus is an additional effort towards openness and transparency in military matters. We

(Mr. Seim, Norway)

are grateful for the manner in which Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden conducted the discussions as Chairman of Working Group I.

In accordance with the reform package adopted in 1990, all the three remaining items on our agenda are, in principle, to be finalized in 1993. Much work remains to be done before that can be achieved. The report on nuclear disarmament is a good basis for future work. However, my delegation had hoped that it would have been possible to make further headway on regional disarmament.

As for the item on science and technology, my delegation supports the idea put forward by the European Community that a further focusing of the work seems necessary to facilitate the development of concrete recommendations next year. We share the view that the Disarmament Commission should concentrate on the role of science and technology in the context of disarmament.

In implementing the basic thrust of the reform programme, much time and resources have to be allocated to each of the three remaining agenda items at our next session. In my delegation's view, taking into account the necessity during this year's session to allocate more time to Working Group I, it might still be difficult to finalize all three agenda items next year.

There are always various solutions to a practical problem. One solution would be to postpone the final work on one of the agenda items until 1994. This would leave us with only two issues to finalize during next year's session. My delegation is flexible as to which agenda item should eventually be left over to 1994. On this question, we would go along with the issue that commands consensus.

(Mr. Seim, Norway)

Various issues have been proposed both formally and informally to replace the agenda item on objection information on military matters. In our opinion, non-proliferation, illicit arms trade, transparency in armaments and verification are all questions that merit consideration by the Disarmament Commission. However, given the political concern regarding proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, there would probably be a broad interest to address this question, as proposed by Sweden. The Nordic position regarding non-proliferation was stated last week by the Foreign Ministers of the Nordic countries. Here I refer to the statement just made by my Finnish colleague. The question of replacement of the item on objective information on military matters should be subject to further consultations before a final decision is reached.

Despite the promising developments during this year's session, further improvements in the structure and functioning of the Disarmament Commission seem necessary. In this regard, the role of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body should be underlined. We should be careful not to allow the Disarmament Commission to be transformed into a negotiating body. Its primary functions should continue to be of a deliberative nature.

Mr. LI Genxin (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The 1992 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission is drawing to a successful conclusion. On this occasion, please allow me, in the name of the Chinese delegation, to thank you Sir, for the effective and excellent manner in which you conducted our deliberations and for your contribution to the smooth fulfilment of our mandate for this session. At the same time, I should also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden, who was Chairman of Working

(Mr. Li Genxin, China)

Group I and who worked very hard to complete consideration of agenda item 4 with outstanding leadership. I should also like to express our appreciation to Ambassador Prakash Shah of India, Ambassador Ricardo Luna of Peru, Ambassador Emika Ayo Azikiwe of Nigeria, for their excellent work. I also extend our thanks to Mr. Davinic, Director of the Office of Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung and other officials of the Office. Our thanks also go to the Secretaries, translators and interpreters for their effective cooperation.

This session was convened at a time of drastic changes in the international situation. The international community is now more committed to the establishment of a new international order on the basis of the objectives and principles of the United Nations Charter. The relevant norms governing international relations have been emphasized. During the last three weeks, we have had comprehensive and in-depth deliberations on the four substantive items on the agenda of this session in an earnest, pragmatic and cooperative atmosphere. We have also completed the deliberations on the item on objective information on military matters as called for by the reform of the Disarmament Commission, come up with a consensus text and achieved preliminary results. We are, therefore, very pleased.

However, we must also emphasize that this success is only preliminary. The task ahead of us is still enormous. Hence, it is our hope that the various delegations will continue to pursue the spirit of constructive cooperation present in the deliberations on the item on objective information on military matters and that we shall redouble our efforts in order to complete the deliberations on the other three substantive agenda items on time.

(Mr. Li Genxin, China)

The Chinese delegation has always attached great importance to and actively participated in the work of the Disarmament Commission. We have adopted a constructive approach on all four substantive items and submitted working papers. We have also studied very seriously the working papers and proposals submitted by other delegations. The Chinese delegation has spared no effort to enhance progress at this session and fully demonstrated a spirit of constructive cooperation and compromise.

In the general debate at the beginning of the session, the Chinese delegation pointed out that the task of this year's session was enormous. The result of our work will have an important impact on the role of the Disarmament Commission. It is our hope that the outcome of the deliberations on the item on objective information on military matters will augur well for the deliberations on the other three substantive items next year.

Ms. PRIEST (United Kingdom): At the conclusion of this year's substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation would like to express its thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, for the skill and wisdom with which you have guided our work. Our thanks extend to the Chairmen of all the Working Groups, to the Disarmament Commission Bureau as a whole, and to the Secretariat.

I should like to place on record that it is with particular satisfaction that my delegation welcomes the sucessful conclusion of the work of Working Group I, which has produced within the time scale envisaged agreed guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters. This item on the streamlined agenda of the Disarmament Commission is one in which my delegation, from the very outset, has taken a close and sustained interest.

That we now have an agreed set of guidelines and recommendations illustrates three basic points. It shows that the streamlined approach to the Disarmament Commission can and does promote a businesslike and efficient way of handling our work. It demonstrates also that it is possible to reach consensus in this body on substantive guidelines and recommendations in fields with which we concern ourselves. This augurs well for the future.

The successful outcome of Working Group I attests also to the skill and dedication of its Chairman, Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden, about whom other delegations, quite rightly in our view, have been fulsome in their praise. That he was able to guide the Working Group to a successful outcome is a tribute not only to his own invaluable contribution to its deliberations but also to the determination and commitment of all delegations to ensuring that the item was reported out this year in accordance with the previously agreed timetable.

Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt would like to take this opportunity, on the occasion of the concluding meeting of the 1992 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, to convey to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Chairmen of the four Working Groups, sincere congratulations on the excellent and productive manner in which our work has been conducted. Thanks are also to be extended to the members of the Secretariat of the Commission and the Office for Disarmament Affairs for their competent and valuable assistance.

We note with satisfaction that Working Group I was able this year to conclude its work on objective information on military matters with the adoption of its report, contained in document A/CN.10/1992/CRP.3. This result undoubtedly confirms the relevance of the adopted ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission and offers reassurance that the Disarmament Commission is capable of achieving tangible results in advancing the objectives of disarmament. The consensus reached in the context of the deliberations of Working Group I was achieved by the high level of cooperation and flexibility displayed by all delegations with a view to promoting openness and transparency in military matters, thereby enhancing the primary objective of general and complete disarmament of all types of weapons. My delegation looks forward to the conclusion of the three remaining substantive items on our agenda during next year's session of the Disarmament Commission in the same spirit and with the equal dedication displayed this year in addressing objective information on military matters.

Concerning the annex of the report of Working Group I, my delegation would like to draw attention to paragraph 12. It is my delegation's understanding that the reference "further developed" refers to the eventual expansion of the scope of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

Mr. WHANNOU (Benin) (interpretation from French): Today more than ever, our Organization faces the greatest challenge of our times: the strengthening of peace and security, which must be guaranteed by the establishment of a collective security system in keeping with the letter and spirit of the San Francisco Charter. The process of general and complete disarmament under international control, as recommended by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978, is within the purview of this common undertaking, given the fact that the excessive accumulation of all kinds of weapons has been one of the characteristics of our time, in which each State is concerned for its own security to the detriment of the security of others.

The Disarmament Commission's work is an important step towards security for all. As the organ for multilateral deliberations on disarmament bringing together all Member States, the Commission is entrusted with elaborating concrete, joint disarmament measures in the form of recommendations to the General Assembly. To that end, its agenda this year included four distinct items particularly directed towards the future: objective information on military matters; process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons; regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security; and role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

We are pleased that the consideration of the first of these items led to concrete measures consisting of provisions that can increase awareness and help achieve progress in the disarmament process. To date, it has been impossible to obtain objective and qualitative information on factors to be taken into account in negotiations, especially since States intending to

(Mr. Whannou, Benin)

protect their interests against any real or potential threat have not been prepared to allow others to penetrate the arcane secrets of their military technology and installations. Hence the resort to secret methods, the only result of which was useless information that only increased suspicion and thereby the risk of confrontation. How could we prevent the threat of weapons of mass destructions if we had no resort to appropriate information and objective communication machinery that would make it possible to eliminate anxieties, fears and one-upmanship?

Regarding the other three substantive agenda items, we were able to identify elements that could be incorporated into our in-depth discussions at the next session. We therefore hope that the same spirit of joint effort and understanding that prevailed this year will allow us to achieve concrete recommendations in 1993, especially since, in conformity with the the text governing the streamlining of the work of our Commission, we are called upon to conclude those three items. We know that it cannot be otherwise, because everybody today is aware of the danger, cost and futility of overarmament. Moreover, any State engaged in overarming only causes concern to others, beginning with its immediate neighbours.

Therefore, we shall have to come to an understanding at all levels - regional and international - to subjugate the belligerent sides of science and technology that have led to qualitative and quantitative increases in weapons over the past 50 years through inter-State rivalries. Now that these rivalries are subsiding, we shall have to limit the diversion of resources so necessary to meeting the normal, everyday needs of mankind in order to curtail the potential of nations for aggression.

(Mr. Whannou, Benin)

As we approach the end of our substantive work in 1992, our delegation would like to thank all those who have been involved in the Commission's work and contributed to progress in the cause of disarmament.

Mr. STELZER (Austria): Before contributing some brief concluding remarks on the 1992 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, the Austrian delegation would like to commend you, Sir, on the results achieved under your chairmanship. You were entrusted with the responsibility not only of facilitating the deliberations of the four Working Groups but also of securing concrete results on the agenda item in its third year, "Objective information on military matters"; besides providing the intellectual input we expected of you, you also displayed remarkable organizational leadership by skilfully allocating the available time to the concluding work in Working Group I and to the deliberations of the other three Working Groups.

My delegation would also like, through you, to thank the Chairmen of the four Working Groups. Ambassador Hyltenius successfully concluded the work on objective information on military matters - an agenda item on which the Austrian Ambassador, Peter Hohenfellner, had the privilege of conducting the first year of deliberations. By concluding this agenda item on schedule, Ambassador Hyltenius made an essential contribution to the future of the reformed Disarmament Commission.

I would also like to thank Ambassador Shah of India, Ambassador Luna of Peru and Ambassador Azikiwe of Nigeria, who skilfully chaired the other Working Groups. With their contribution they have laid a solid groundwork for the last round of deliberations on their respective agenda items.

My delegation would also like to express sincere thanks to Ambassador Mason, who successfully chaired the Group of Friends of the Chairman in Working Group IV.

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

The timely adoption of the consensus text on guidelines and recommendations with respect to objective information on military matters has proved that the Disarmament Commission can fulfil the high expectations expressed in numerous statements during the general debate at this substantive session. My delegation considers that document to be a cornerstone of the Disarmament Commission. We foresee that it will have an impact on the process of increasing transparency in military matters and will make a contribution to confidence- and security-building. Thus will it enhance international peace and security.

At the successful conclusion of the 1992 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation would like to make some remarks on the future procedure of the Disarmament Commission. Practical work at this year's session, and comments by delegations, show a remarkable measure of agreement on the reform of the Commission put into practice last year. My delegation agrees that the reform has provided the Commission with an adequate working structure. Nevertheless, some fine-tuning of the structure on the basis of the experience of this year and last year might have some merit.

The prospect of next year's special session, which by current provisions is required to conclude consideration of the remaining three substantive agenda items, while at the same time initiating deliberations on a new item, might justify some modifications.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation will carefully consider the suggestions you made last week on how to approach this problem, and we look forward to participating in consultations on this issue during the year.

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

Regarding the future work of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation would like to add an additional consideration to the useful suggestions made in previous statements. We believe that the three-year time-frame provided for the deliberations on each agenda item requires a systematic approach to discussion. As was suggested earlier, the Chairman of a Working Group should not simply take up what a predecessor in that Working Group concluded in the deliberations of the previous year. My delegation has repeatedly emphasized the importance of inter-sessional consultations to be conducted by the Chairmen of the Working Groups prior to the substantive session. Those consultations could preclude the time-consuming procedural discussions that repeatedly consume scarce time during the substantive sessions, and could prepare the general outline of the substantive deliberations in order to provide for the effective utilization of the three weeks available during the substantive session.

In spite of my remarks on how we would suggest the Commission make its deliberations even more successful in the future, my delegation agrees with the very positive assessments of this year's session made by previous speakers. The 1992 Disarmament Commission did not appear to be a sick patient; a few modifications will make it strong in a very positive environment. We believe that at this point the Disarmament Commission has passed the test of effectiveness, and we trust that under your chairmanship, Sir, you will be able in the course of the consultations I am sure you will be holding during the rest of the year to provide an ideal framework for next year's deliberations.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: Let me share a few words of summary and reflection as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission at this 1992 session, which we shall be concluding in a few minutes. There can be no doubt that the last three weeks have been hard on all delegations, but their hard work has also brought undeniable results.

In the field where we have to perform our duties - the field of international security and disarmament - results are difficult to measure. Sometimes the temptation of verbosity is hard to resist. One finds brevity and clarity difficult to achieve. We have to reckon with the fact that in the field of international security and disarmament concrete measures can only be taken by the unanimous will of all the parties concerned. Consequently, specific proposals designed to lead to such measures had better be made with a great measure of unanimity. In the course of the past three weeks the aspiration to achieve unanimity - to adopt every single sentence, sometimes every word or even letter, by consensus - has prevailed over everything else.

Delegations have manifested a desire to achieve consensus on almost every question. They also showed a fair amount of readiness to reach that consensus. Whenever the matter in question had a direct bearing on the real issue, consensus was usually reached, even if not always easily. Whenever consensus was really difficult to reach - or in some cases when it remained hopelessly beyond reach and when substantive ideas or recommendations had to be abandoned - this was ultimately due to various considerations which in fact had little relevance to the heart of the issue. As I see it, in most cases such considerations have only diverted attention from the real subject-matter; they led to long debates and always carried with them the threat of failure.

(The Chairman)

This phenomenon is obviously not a novelty. It has often prevailed in the past in the Commission's activities; it has prevailed in other forums inside and outside the United Nations. The phenomenon was long considered a natural consequence of international relations basically characterized by cold-war confrontation. With all the dramatic changes of recent years, however, that phenomenon is clearly outdated. It can only serve to prevent progress in the desired concrete directions. It can prevent the Disarmament Commission from attaining the purposeful utility it was created to provide.

(The Chairman)

On the other hand, it is encouraging in this context that the perception of delegations and their overall evaluation of the work of the 1992 session of the Disarmament Commission are impregnated, perhaps more than before, by a sense of sober realism and critical attitude indicating equally the bright aspects of our work and those areas where, in the view of many, we have yet to exert additional efforts to live up to the expectations of the international community. I believe that this down-to-earth approach should also guide us in the future.

The year 1992 was the second year for the Commission to work in its new organizational framework. In the past two years the Commission has been able to live up to the expectations, in spite of difficulties and various limitations of time and logistics. Under such circumstances, the results achieved in the four Working Groups, and most of all the valuable document produced in Working Group I, must be appreciated even more. However, if the Commission wants fully to live up to all the expectations, if it wants to benefit from the historic changes of our times, modifications are required in the ways and means of its operation. These modifications are called for by the extremely heavy workload delegations will have to handle next year, and most probably in the years to come.

In the course of this session, extensive discussions focused on the need for certain changes in the structuring of the Commission's work, in the distribution of subjects over the years, and for other possible modifications, which all could serve to refine the present system of activity. Discussions will continue in the following months and, we hope, will lead to certain practical steps to take at the organizational session later in the year.

(The Chairman)

I am fully convinced that, if delegations take a fresh look into the future, and if they also manage to make the appropriate corrections, the Disarmament Commission will certainly become the kind of forum that was envisaged by so many for so long.

Before concluding my statement, I wish to state clearly that all the progress and all the success achieved during this session was due in no small measure to the excellent guidance and leadership displayed by the Chairmen of the subsidiary bodies. On behalf of all the delegations, and on my own behalf, I wish to express our appreciation to Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden, who guided Working Group I, over difficult and sometimes even rough waters, to full success. As we all know, we were particularly interested in seeing Working Group I terminate its work and carry out its mandate successfully and on time. These efforts were brought to fruition most happily. The applause of members of Working Group I at 9.30 Friday night marked a new phase in the Commission's history, and not only the end of three years' efforts. It proved for everyone that a reasonable degree of success is possible. This example, and naturally the valuable chairmanships of Ambassador Prakash Shah of India, Ambassador Ricardo Luna and his deputy Mr. Javier Paulinich of Peru, and Ambassador Emeka Ayo Azikiwe of Nigeria, reinforce us in our conviction that the other Working Groups will also achieve the desired outcome.

Let me extend our gratitude to all the Vice-Chairmen, as well as to the Rapporteur of the Commission, Mr. Bob Hiensch of the Netherlands, for their assistance.

(The Chairman)

I am sure all delegations join me in expressing sincere thanks to Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, as well as to the members of the Office of Disarmament Affairs, under the direction of Mr. Prvoslav Davinic, for the invaluable support they have provided throughout the entire session. We are particularly grateful to Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, long-time Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Timur Alasaniya, Ms. Jennifer Mackby and Ms. Lucy Webster, who served as secretaries of Working Groups. Their advice and assistance were always indispensable. Our thanks and appreciation is also addressed to the Conference and Documents Officers, and our friends behind the glass in the back of this room who not only had to listen to our often lengthy statements but also had to understand them and interpret them faithfully and patiently.

In conclusion, I wish to express, on behalf of all the members of the extended Bureau, and also on behalf of the Secretariat, as well as on my own behalf, sincere thanks to the representatives for the kind words they expressed to us. We can assure them of our reciprocal feelings - all the more so as expressions of appreciation are due, first and foremost, to the members of the delegations themselves. Without their good will and cooperation such happy results could not have been achieved. Let me, therefore, thank you all for your support, as well as for the honour of having afforded me the opportunity to chair the Disarmament Commission in 1992.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the 1992 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission closed.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.